

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-32 and 34-37, and 39-44 are currently pending in the application. Applicants have canceled claim 38, added claim 44 and amended claims 1-3, 5-11, 13, 15-17, 22, 26-28, 30, 35-37, 40, and 43. The claims have been amended in order to convert means-plus-function claims to structural claims. Applicants request reconsideration of the application in light of the following remarks.

**Change of Address**

The office action was sent to Squire, Sanders & Dempsey LLP. Applicant respectfully requests that all future correspondence for this patent application be sent to:

Albert L. Schmeiser  
**Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts**  
18 East University Drive, #101  
Mesa, AZ 85201  
(480) 655-0073

**Telephone Interview**

Applicant's attorney wishes to thank the Examiner for his courtesy and time during a telephone interview that was held on June 17, 2005. The Examiner's comments and insights were very helpful in preparing this response. It is hoped that the comments below reflect the spirit of the interview.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the cited prior art reference must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. Furthermore, the suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based upon the Applicants' disclosure. A failure to meet any one of these criteria is a failure to

establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. MPEP §2143.

### Claims

#### Claims 1-9, 13-22, 24-29 and 35

Claims 1-9, 13-22, 24-29 and 35 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henrikson et al. (U.S. Application No. 2003/0053612, hereinafter “Henrikson”), in view of Peltz (U.S. Patent No. 6,205,716, hereinafter “Peltz”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and requests reconsideration of the claims.

Applicant now claims in amended independent claim 1 “wherein the conference control station determines sites for the conference by comparing available sites to locations to which participants are allowed access;. . .” Henrikson and Peltz, taken singly or together do not teach this element as claimed by Applicant.

Henrikson at best schedules a time for a conference call and reserves any equipment required. Henrikson does not teach scheduling a site for a conference and never suggests that the participants may not be allowed access to certain sites. Peltz teaches that its modular video conference enclosure may be used in a prison (Col. 5 lines 62-67 of Peltz), but does not address issues that would be necessary for regular use of the system of the present invention. For example, comparing available sites to locations to which inmate participants and scheduling participant stations accordingly is not addressed in either of Henrikson or Peltz. In particular, Peltz does not teach any method of scheduling conferences or sites for conferences in association with application of the Peltz system in a prison or other secure area. Therefore, Peltz does not remedy the lackings of Henrikson, and Henrikson in view of Peltz does not disclose or suggest that the “conference control station determines sites for the conference by comparing available sites to locations to which participants are allowed access;. . .”. On the other hand, the system of the present invention has the advantage of a more universally applicable prison communication system due to its site determination features. Thus, it can be used on an ongoing basis for many different types of communication for any and all eligible inmates within the prison, for example. On the contrary, the combination of Henrikson and Peltz at most suggests a system that

schedules a time for participants to have a conference call (as taught by Henrikson), through the use of modular video conference enclosures (as taught by Peltz), which does not now meet the limitations of claim 1. Therefore claim 1 is considered to be allowable over Henrikson and Peltz..

Dependant claims 2-4 are allowable over Henrikson in view of Peltz, among other reasons, for depending directly or indirectly from allowable claim 1.

In claim 5, applicant now claims “wherein the conference control station identifies appropriate sites for the conference through comparing available sites to areas to which the participants are allowed access; . . .” Henrikson and/or Peltz also do not teach this element as claimed by Applicant.

In secured situations, such as those found in a prison or in other high security facilities, it may be that conference participants are not allowed access to certain sites in the facility. For instance, prisoners in a prison may not be allowed access to certain sites in the prison for security reasons or because the prisoner’s enemies may be in certain parts of the prison. By inputting this type of information into the conference control station, the conference control station can identify available sites which the prisoners / participants have access to.

This is also true in high security facilities where certain participants may only be allowed access to certain sites in the facility due to their security clearance. For instance, visitors may only be allowed in the lobby. Other participants, that have a low security clearance may only be allowed on certain floors of the facility. Therefore, the conference control station’s ability to determine the most appropriate site for the conference by taking these factors into account is very important in secured situations.

Neither Henrikson or Peltz teaches or suggests identifying appropriate sites for a conference, as pointed out in the arguments against the rejection of claim 1 above. Henrikson does not teach or suggest anything about the sites at which participants are to attend the conference call. Peltz simply suggest various locations where the modular video conference enclosure of the Peltz patent may be placed. Peltz does not suggest that individuals are directed to specific sites or that a computer system must determine available

or appropriate sites. Neither Henrikson nor Peltz discusses that participants may not be allowed access to certain sites and that a station that schedules a conference may need to determine whether or not a participant is allowed to the location where an available site is. A combination of Henrikson and Peltz would therefore at best suggest a system for scheduling conferences where one of the locations at which participants may be located for the conference is a modular video conference enclosure. Therefore claim 5 is considered to be allowable over Henrikson in view of Peltz.

Amended independent claim 6 now recites a system “wherein the conference control station selects a time for the participant to begin transit to the site where the conference will be held.” The time to begin transit to a site is very important in a prison situation due to the fact that the prisoner must be let out of his cell at the appropriate time to travel to the site for the conference. This is also true in secured facilities where a participant may need to go through security before reaching the conference site. Neither Henrikson or Peltz discuss or suggest that the time for transit to a site should be taken into consideration in scheduling a conference. In particular, Peltz does not discuss the scheduling of a conference, or any of the particulars needed for scheduling in a prison setting. Peltz simply discusses a modular video conference enclosure that can be used for conference calls. Henrikson teaches a system that schedules times and equipment for conference calls. Rather, the combination of Peltz and Henrikson at best would disclose a system for scheduling the time and equipment for a conference call wherein a participant of the conference call may attend via a modular video conference enclosure. Henrikson does not, however, ever discuss transit time as a factor to be considered in scheduling a conference. Having a system configured to select “a time for the participant to begin transit to the site” addresses a safety issue in a prison setting since extra time may provide the opportunity for a participant to undertake violent or other prohibited behavior. Thus, the amendment to claim 6 adds a material limitation that is not addressed by Henrikson or Peltz. Therefore, claim 6 is considered to be allowable over Henrikson and Peltz.

Koreeda, another patent referred to by the examiner in the referenced Office Action, does disclose taking into account the transit time of a participant in order to schedule the most opportune time for a conference. (Col. 11, lines 22-45 of Koreeda et al.). Koreeda does

not, however, discuss selecting a time at which the participant should begin transit to the site at which the conference is to be held. Therefore Peltz, Henrikson and Koreeda in combination would at best teach a system in which a conference call is scheduled for a time when a participant will be available, where the conference call would take place in a modular video conference enclosure. Therefore claim 6 is considered to be allowable over Henrikson in view of Peltz and Koreeda.

Dependant claims 7 and 8 are also considered allowable over Henrikson in view of Peltz, among other reasons, for depending directly or indirectly from allowable claim 6.

Applicant now claims in amended independent claim 9, a system “wherein participant stations are identified by comparing the location of available stations to locations which participants’ are allowed access;. . .” In prison or secured facilities, participants may not be allowed to certain participant stations. For instance, prisoners may not be allowed in certain areas due to security reasons or because the prisoner’s enemies live in a certain cell block or the like. Therefore having the system determine available sites which the participant is allowed access to is very important in secured facilities. Henrikson does not teach indentifying available sites for a conference and never suggests that the participants may not be allowed access to certain sites. Peltz teaches that its modular video conference enclosure may be used in various locations such as prisons (Col. 5 lines 62-67 of Peltz). Peltz does not suggest, however, that in scheduling conferences locations to which the participant has access must be taken into account. At best the combination of Peltz and Henrikson would suggest a system for scheduling time and equipment for conference calls wherein participants of the conference may attend through a modular video enclosure. No where in either of these patents is a participant’s access taken into consideration. Therefore claim 9 is considered to be allowable over Henrikson in view of Peltz.

Dependant claims 13-16 are considered allowable over Henrikson in view of Peltz, among other reasons, for depending directly or indirectly from allowable claim 9.

Independent claim 17, as now amended, is also not obvious in light of Henrikson and Peltz. Claim 17 claims a method for conducting a conference comprising “a step for calculating a time for a participant to begin to get ready for the conference based on a transit

time associated with the participant or the participant's location; . . .” The time to begin to get ready for a conference is very important in prison situations due to the fact that the prisoner must be let out of his cell at the appropriate time to travel to the site for the conference. This is also true in secured facilities where a participant may need to go through security before reaching the conference site. Neither Henrikson or Peltz discusses or suggest that the time for transit to a site should be taken into consideration in scheduling a conference. In particular, Peltz does not discuss the scheduling of a conference. Peltz simply discusses a modular video conference enclosure that can be used for conference calls. Henrikson teaches a system that schedules times and equipment for conference calls. Henrikson does not, however, ever discuss transit time as a factor to be considered in scheduling a conference. Nor do either of Henrikson or Peltz show or teach the step of “calculating a time for a participant to begin to get ready for the conference based on a transit time”. The combination of Peltz and Henrikson at best may teach a system for scheduling the time and equipment for a conference call wherein a participant of the conference call may attend via a modular video conference enclosure, and not in a system like that of the present invention. Therefore, claim 17 is considered to be allowable over Henrikson and Peltz.

Koreeda, another patent referred to by the examiner in the referenced Office Action, does disclose taking into account the transit time of a participant in order to schedule the most opportune time for a conference. (Col. 11, lines 22-45 of Koreeda et al.). Koreeda does not, however, discuss selecting a time at which the participant should begin to get ready or begin transit to the site at which the conference is to be held. Furthermore, Koreeda does not address the recitation in the last three lines of claim 17 with regard to “directing a participant to a participant station in accordance with the notice”. This limitation has particular significance in the present application since “obtaining notice at the control station of a site, the notice comprising the conference identifier, the identifier of a participant, and the identifier of a participant station” as recited in lines 5-6 are critical steps for safety in a prison setting, and have advantages in other secured site applications. It is clear that “directing” in claim 17 has special significance in a prison setting. Pelts, Henrikson, and Koreeda do not have this step of “directing the participant” in combination with the special

identifiers of the conference identifier, the participant identifier, and the station identifier that are so advantageous in a prison setting. Rather, Peltz, Henrikson and Koreeda in combination would at best teach a system in which a conference call is scheduled for a time when a participant will be available even if the participant has to travel from one location to another. Also, Henrikson, Peltz, and Koreeda at best teach the conference call taking place in a modular video conference enclosure, and not in a system like that of the present invention. Therefore claim 17 is considered to be allowable over Henrikson in view of Peltz and Koreeda.

Dependant claims 18-21 are considered allowable over Henrikson in view of Peltz, among other reasons, for depending directly or indirectly from allowable claim 17.

Independent claim 22 is also not taught or suggested by Henrikson in view of Peltz. Claim 22 discloses “a step for obtaining confirmation that a participant is allowed access to a location where the alternative participant station is located; . . .” In prison or secured facilities, participants may not be allowed to certain participant stations. For instance, prisoners may not be allowed in certain areas due to security reasons or because the prisoner’s enemies live in a certain cell block or the like. Therefore having the system determine available sites which the participant is allowed access to is very important in secured facilities. Neither Henrikson or Peltz discloses a step for obtaining confirmation that a participant is allowed access to a location where an alternative participant station is located. In fact, Henrikson does not discuss scheduling a location for a conference call. Instead Henrikson simply teaches scheduling the time and equipment required for a conference call. Peltz does not teach or suggest anything concerning the scheduling of a conference. Instead, Peltz simply teaches a modular video conference enclosure which presumably may be used in a conference call. Therefore the combination of Henrikson in view of Peltz would at best simply disclose a system that schedules time and equipment for a conference call where one site involved in the conference call is a modular video conference enclosure. Therefore claim 22 is considered to be allowable over Henrikson in view of Peltz.

Dependant claims 24 and 25 are considered allowable over Henrikson in view of Peltz, among other reasons, for depending directly or indirectly from allowable claim 22.

Henrikson and/or Peltz do not make independent claim 26 obvious, as currently amended. In particular, neither Henrikson or Peltz discloses “a step for determining the location of participant stations available for the rescheduled conference; and a step for comparing the location of available participant stations with locations to which the participant is allowed access.” In prison or secured facilities, participants may not be allowed to certain participant stations. For instance, prisoners may not be allowed in certain areas due to security reasons or because the prisoner’s enemies live in a certain cell block or the like. Therefore having the system determine available sites which the participant is allowed access to is very important in secured facilities. Neither Henrikson or Peltz discusses the determining of a location at which participants will participate in a conference call or video conference. Peltz does not even discuss scheduling a conference call. Instead Peltz discloses a modular video conference enclosure at which a conference call may be participated in. Therefore the best possible combination of the two references would suggest a conference call scheduling system that schedules the time, participants and equipment for a conference call wherein the conference call may be participated in from a modular video conference enclosure. Therefore claim 26 is considered to be allowable over Henrikson in view of Peltz.

Dependant claim 27 is considered allowable over Henrikson in view of Peltz, among other reasons, for depending from allowable claim 26.

Independent Claim 28 also discloses elements that are not obvious in light of Henrikson in view of Peltz. Claim 28 discloses “a step for determining whether or not the participants are allowed to have a conference with each other.” Prisoners have specific people which they are allowed to meet with. Anyone not on the list of specific people must either have individual approval or are simply not allowed to meet with the prisoner depending on the prison policies or any number of other factors. Therefore it is important to determine whether or not the participants in a conference are allowed to meet.

Claim 28 also discloses “a step for revising determining whether or not the conference

should be recorded and if recorded, whether or not the participants should be notified of the recording; . . .” Once it is determined that the participants are allowed to meet, the system must then decide whether or not the conference should be recorded. Certain conference may be more desirable to record than others and the factors determining this may be given to the system in order to allow the decision to be made. It is also possible that a prison may decide that all conferences should be recorded. In this situation, this factor should also be given to the system in order to allow it to schedule and activate recording devices for every conference. There are, however, also situations where it would be illegal to record the conversation of a prisoner. For example, conferences between a prisoner and his attorney are off limits since they are protected by attorney client privilege, as are conferences between a prisoner and his clergy or a prisoner and his wife. The system may therefore also determine whether or not it is allowable for the conference to be recorded. Once the system has decided to record the conference. The system must then determine whether or not the participants in the conference should be informed that the conference is being recorded, as now recited in Claim 28.

Neither Henrikson or Peltz ever teach, suggest or contemplate that certain participants may not be allowed to meet with other participants and that certain conferences should be recorded and certain conferences must not be recorded.

Henrikson simply discloses a system for scheduling a conference call wherein a conference requestor lists participants and potential dates that they would like a conference call scheduled for. It is assumed in Henrikson that any participant may have a conference call with any other participant. The system then schedules the participants, equipment and the time for the conference call. It may be possible using the Henrikson system to schedule a recorder to record the conference. Henrikson, however, leaves all of the decisions concerning whether or not to record the conference in the hands of the requestor. Peltz does not teach or suggest anything concerning scheduling a conference. Peltz simply discloses a modular video conference enclosure which may be used in conference calls. Therefore a combination of Henrikson and Peltz at best teaches a system wherein any participant may schedule a conference with any other participant and may determine that the conference should be recorded. The conference may then be held from a modular video conference

enclosure. Therefore claim 28 is considered to be allowable over Henrikson in view of Peltz.

Dependant claim 29 is also considered allowable over Henrikson in view of Peltz, among other reasons, for depending from allowable claim 28.

Henrikson in view of Peltz also does not make newly amended independent claim 35 obvious. Claim 35 claims “a step for maintaining for at least one participant of the plurality a list of participants the at least one participant is allowed to confer with; a step for confirming that each participant of the plurality is allowed to confer with every other participant of the plurality; . . .” Neither Henrikson and/or Peltz ever teach, suggest or contemplate that certain participants may not be allowed to confer with other participants. This type of situation occurs quite frequently in high security situations such as meetings with prisoners, as discussed above.

Henrikson simply discloses a system for scheduling a conference call wherein a conference requestor lists participants and potential dates that they would like a conference call scheduled for. The system then schedules the participants, equipment and the time for the conference call. It is assumed in Henrikson that any participant may have a conference call with any other participant. Peltz does not teach or suggest anything concerning scheduling a conference. Peltz simply discloses a modular video conference enclosure which may be used in conference calls. Therefore a combination of Henrikson and Peltz at best teaches a system wherein any participant may schedule a conference with any other participant and that conference may be held from a modular video conference enclosure. Therefore claim 35 is considered to be allowable over Henrikson in view of Peltz..

Claims 10-12, 23, and 36-43

Claims 10-12, 23, and 36-43 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henrikson et al. (U.S. Application No. 2003/0053612, hereinafter “Henrikson”), in view of Peltz (U.S. Patent No. 6,205,716, hereinafter “Peltz”) and further in view of Kannes (U.S. Patent No. 4,965,819, hereinafter “Kannes”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration of the claims.

Claim 9 describes a system for scheduling conference calls “wherein participant stations are identified by comparing the location of available stations to locations which participants’ are allowed access;. . .” As discussed above, Claim 9 is considered to be allowable over Henrikson in view of Peltz. Kannes describes a conferencing system that facilitates interactive video and audio communications between individuals. Kannes does not discuss a system for scheduling conference calls. Therefore Henrikson in view of Peltz and Kannes does not teach or suggest a system for scheduling conference calls “wherein participant stations are identified by comparing the location of available stations to locations which participants’ are allowed access;. . .” Kannes does not remedy the deficiencies of Peltz and Henrikson. Therefore, claim 9 is considered to be allowable over Henrikson in view of Peltz and Kannes.

Dependant claims 10-12 are considered allowable over Henrikson in view of Peltz and Kannes, among other reasons, for depending directly or indirectly from allowable claim 9.

Claim 22 describes “a step for obtaining confirmation that a participant is allowed access to a location where the alternative participant station is located; . . .” As detailed above, claim 22 is allowable over Henrikson in view of Peltz. Kannes simply describes a conferencing system that facilitates interactive video and audio communication. Kannes does not describe a system for scheduling a conference and therefore the addition of Kannes does not make claim 22 obvious. Therefore claim 22 is considered to be allowable over Henrikson in view of Peltz and Kannes.

Dependant claim 23 is considered allowable over Henrikson in view of Peltz and Kannes, among other reasons, for depending directly or indirectly from allowable claim 22.

Independent claim 36 recites a method for conducting a video conference system comprising “a step for revising the start time in accordance with failing to detect use of the respective microphone of each station within the respective predetermined time; a step for beginning the conference when use of the respective microphone of each station is detected within the respective predetermined time; a step for terminating the conference when one of the at least two conference coordinators determines that a participant’s behavior is inappropriate; and a step for terminating the conference when termination of use of the

microphone is detected.” Neither Henrickson or Peltz or Kannes teaches or suggests these steps. Henrickson teaches a system for organizing conference calls including scheduling the time, participants and the equipment. Henrickson also teaches that a notice requesting confirmation from the participants and equipment should be sent out shortly prior to the conference call. Henrickson does not, however, use the conference call equipment itself to determine whether or not a participant is present at the scheduled conference time. For instance, using Henrickson, a participant may confirm that they are planning on attending the conference call and then not show up to the conference call. Henrickson has no method of detecting the actual attendance to the conference and therefore does not automatically reschedule the conference. Due to the environment in which Henrickson is applied, Henrickson also does not teach that a conference coordinator is present in order to supervise the conference and determine whether or not the conference should continue based on the behavior of the participants. Peltz also does not attempt to solve this problem. Rather, Peltz only discloses a module video conference enclosure which does not schedule conference calls or contain any means of detecting the attendance of a participant or monitoring the behavior of the participant during the conference. Peltz does not make this aspect of Claim 36 obvious.

Kannes teaches a system that detects when someone is using a microphone. When two microphones are in use at the same time this system offsets the audio from one of the microphones in order to allow the audio from both of the microphones to be heard. Kannes does not, however, teach detecting whether or not a microphone is used within a specific period of time, nor that such a step of detecting should be used to determine whether or not to reschedule a conference. Kannes also does not have a conference coordinator present at the conference who may end the conference if a participant’s behavior is inappropriate. Therefore Kannes does not make Claim 36 obvious.

The combination of Henrickson in view of Peltz and Kannes also does not teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 36. At best the combination of these three patents only teaches a system for scheduling a conference call wherein participants may be located in a modular video conference enclosures. The system also providing notice to participants immediately prior to the conference start in order to attempt to assure attendance. The

conference may be conducted on a system that detects when microphones are in use in order to eliminate overlap of multiple participants attempting to speak at the same time. This combination does not, however, teach or suggest “a step for revising the start time in accordance with failing to detect use of the respective microphone of each station within the respective predetermined time; . . .” or “a step for terminating the conference when one or the at least two conference coordinators determines that a participant’s behavior is inappropriate; . . .” Therefore, Claim 36 is considered to be allowable over Henrikson in view of Peltz and Kannes.

Dependant claims 37, and 39-43 are considered allowable over Henrikson in view of Peltz and Kannes, among other reasons, for depending directly or indirectly from allowable claim 36.

#### Claims 30-32 and 34

Claims 30-32 and 34 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henrikson et al. (U.S. Application No. 2003/0053612, hereinafter “Henrikson”), in view of Peltz (U.S. Patent No. 6,205,716, hereinafter “Peltz”) and further in view of Koreeda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,781,731, hereinafter “Koreeda”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration of the claims.

Independent claim 30 now recites “a step for maintaining for at least one participant of the plurality a list of participants the at least one participant is allowed to confer with; a step for confirming that each participant of the plurality is allowed to confer with every other participant of the plurality;. . .” Neither Henrikson, Peltz and/or Koreeda ever teach, suggest or contemplate that certain participants may not be allowed to meet with other participants. This type of situation occurs quite frequently in high security situations such as meetings with prisoners. Prisoners have specific people which they are allowed to meet with. Anyone not on the list of specific people must either have individual approval or are simply not be allowed to meet with the prisoner depending on the prison policies and many other factors.

Claim 30 also now discloses “a step for determining whether recording the conference between the participants is desired; a step for determining whether recording the conference

is allowed; a step for determining whether the participants of the conference should be notified that the conference is being recorded; . . .” In high security applications, it may be desirable to record the conference. However, there are certain conferences which can not be recorded, such as a prisoner’s conference with his lawyer or clergy. Therefore it is desirable to have a system that determines whether or not the conference will be recorded.

Henrikson simply discloses a system for scheduling a conference call wherein a conference requestor lists participants and potential dates that they would like a conference call scheduled for. The system then schedules the participants, equipment and the time for the conference call. Henrikson could potentially allow the requestor to have the conference recorded. It is assumed in Henrikson, however, that any participant may have a conference call with any other participant and that any conference may be recorded if the requestor desires. However, this determination is not effected by the system of Henrikson as it is in the present invention. Peltz does not teach or suggest anything concerning scheduling a conference. Peltz simply discloses a modular video conference enclosure which may be used in conference calls. Koreeda discloses a system which controls the audio and video input and output in a video conferencing system. Therefore a combination of Henrikson, Peltz and Koreeda at best teaches a system wherein any participant may schedule and record a conference with any other participant and that conference may be held from a modular video conference enclosure, which may contain software that switches the audio and video signals broadcast depending on which participant is speaking. Therefore claim 30 is considered to be allowable over Henrikson in view of Peltz and Koreeda.

Dependant claims 31, 32 and 34 are considered allowable over Henrikson in view of Peltz and Koreeda, among other reasons, for depending directly or indirectly from allowable claim 30.

Claim 38 has been canceled without traverse to obtain immediate allowance of the allowable subject matter. The rejection of claim 38 is, therefore, obviated.

Applicants respectfully request that the obviousness rejections of claims 1-32, 34-37

and 39-43 be withdrawn, and that these claims be allowed.

**Newly Added Claim 44**

Claim 44 was newly added with this response and relates to the embodiment of the invention recited in claim 22. No new matter was added.

**Regarding Doctrine of Equivalents**

Applicants hereby declare that any amendments herein that are not specifically made for the purpose of patentability are made for other purposes, such as clarification, and that no such changes shall be construed as limiting the scope of the claims or the application of the Doctrine of Equivalents.


**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is requested that a two-month extension of time be granted for the filing of this response, and the appropriate extension filing fee of \$225.00 is enclosed herewith.

If any fees, including extension of time fees or additional claims fees, are due as a result of this response, please charge Deposit Account No. 19-0513. This authorization is intended to act as a constructive petition for an extension of time, should an extension of time be needed as a result of this response. The examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if this would in any way advance the prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 27, 2005

By   
David E. Allred  
Reg. No. 47,254

**SCHMEISER, OLSEN & WATTS LLP**  
18 East University Drive, #101  
Mesa, AZ 85201  
(480) 655-0073